

Remarks

In the advisory action mailed October 4, 2010, the proposed amendment was not entered, and claims 1-3 and 5-30 stand rejected under the final rejection mailed June 22, 2010.

In the final rejection, claims 1, 2, 5-12, 14-22, and 24-30 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Yip et al (US 6,859,615).

Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yip in view of Sugimura (US 3,410,488).

Finally, claim 23 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over YIP in view of Arabori et al (US 4,870,254) or Ueda (US 4,375,586).

Yip discloses a vertically oriented, multi-fragrance dispenser 110 including a base 114 and a domed cover 116 that may be removed from the base. The cover 116 includes an opening 118 at an upper end for the emission of vaporized scents. Three bottle holding areas 132 include platforms 146 which hold fragrance bottles 156 having wicks 162 extending upwardly from the bottles. Heater housings 170 are disposed within the housing 110 on one side of the bottles such that wick ends 162 extend into central openings 171 in the heater housing.

Yip includes a fan 238 from which air is directed upwardly through openings 244 and vertically through the dispenser exit opening 118. The fan of Yip is not positioned so that air is delivered across the wick ends or an area in which the wick ends vaporize. Instead, the fan directs air generally parallel to the wicks wherein the vapors and air flow combine in the upper housing to exit the exit opening.

In addition, Yip does not disclose a tapered nozzle positioned transverse to the

wick end, or wick end areas for creating a flow across the wick end areas to more completely entrain the vapors and carry them out the opposite side of the housing.

The above differences, and others, are now pointed out in the claims wherein the transverse positioning of the tapered nozzle and the generally transverse air flow is targeted across the wick end vaporization areas so that efficient mixing of the air and vapors is created prior to delivery from the housing.

The secondary referenced cited in the rejection, Sugimura, Arabori, and Ueda, do not remedy the noted deficiencies of Yip.

The applicant wishes to thank the examiner for two interviews in which the proposed changes to the claims were discussed in order to place the application in better condition for the filing of a RCE.

Favorable action on the claims and passing of the case to issue is respectfully requested in due course of Patent Office business.

Respectfully submitted,



Cort Flint, Reg. No. 27,260
McNair Law Firm, PA
P.O. Box 447
Greenville, SC 29602
Telephone: (864) 232-4261
Attorneys for the Applicant